DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 928 CE 005 822

TITLE	Texas Conference for Vocational Administrators and Vocational Supervisors (Texas A & M University, October 8-11, 1974).
INSTITUTION	Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Coll. of Education.; Texas Education Agency, Austin.
REPORT NO	VT-102-299
PUB DATE	Oct 74
NOTE	73p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; *Community Relations; *Conference Reports; Educational Administration; *Educational Finance; Statewide Planning; Summative Evaluation; Supervisors; *Vocational Directors; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Texas

ABSTRACT

The general sessions of the nationwide conference for vocational administrators and supervisors addressed the topics of: (1) weighted pupil funding and implications for vocational education, (2) State funding as conceived by the governor's staff, (3) area school jurisdictions, (4) present funding and vocational education, and (5) the challenge of vocational education. Summaries of sectional meeting speeches on community relations, financing vocational education, evaluation of vocational education, techniques of supervision, the management of vocational education, and the role of the instructional officer are also included. The results of participant evaluation conclude the report. (NJ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Proceedings

ED115928

Texas A&M University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OCTOBER 8-11, 1974

Conference of . . .
Vocational Administrators and Supervisors

College of Education
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
College Station, Texas

CE 005 822

IN COOPERATION WITH
Texas Education Agency

The Texas Education Agency

TEXAS

CONFERENCE FOR

VOCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

AND

VOCATIONAL SUPERVISORS

RECEIVED
JUN 27 1975
Info. Acq., CVTE

J. Earl Rudder Conference Tower
Texas A&M University
October 8-11, 1974

VT 102299

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR

THE PROJECT

J. B. Whiteley, Deputy Superintendent
Occupational and Continuing Education
Houston Public Schools

L. V. Ballard
Director
Public School Occupational
Programs
Texas Education Agency

Jimmy Cheek
Instructor
Agricultural Education
Texas A&M University

Gabe H. Dooley, Jr.
Vocational Director
La Grange Public Schools

John R. Guemple
Associate Commissioner
for Occupational Education
and Technology
Texas Education Agency

Charles Jones
Vocational Director
Bryan Public Schools

Alton Ice, Executive Director
The State Advisory Council for
Technical-Vocational Education
Austin, Texas

R. M. McAbee
Associate Assistant
Superintendent
for Vocational-Industrial
Education
Fort Worth Public Schools

Cadar Parr
Vocational Director
Irving Public Schools

Dr. Leo Schreiner
Educational Program Director
Occupational Education
Personnel Development
Texas Education Agency

Terry Thompson
Department of Personnel & Training
Brown & Root, Inc., Houston

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY STEERING COMMITTEE

Dr. Donald Clark

Dr. Jim Boone

Dr. Ray Perkins

Eugene C. Fisher

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. GENERAL SESSIONS — Page

Address 1

Byrl Shoemaker
Director, Vocational Education
Ohio State Department of Education
Columbus, Ohio

Weighted Pupil Funding and Implications for Vocational Education 13

Joe Mills
Director, Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida

State Funding as Conceived by the Governor's Staff 15

Richard Hooker
Director, Governor's Office
Educational Research and Planning
Austin, Texas

Ben Dowd
Director of Planning
Office of the Governor
The State of Texas

Area School Jurisdictions 22

Alton D. Ice
Executive Director
State Advisory Council for Technical-Vocational Education
Austin, Texas

Present Funding, Vocational Education 25

Luther Thompson
Director, Division of Occupational Service and Development
Texas Education Agency

Vocational Education, The Challenge Before Us 31

Dallas Ator
Associate Director
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Table of Contents (Continued)

II. SECTIONAL MEETINGS — Page

Community Relations 37

Gabe Dooley, Chairman

Jean Nipper
Houston Public Schools

Betty Herring
Fort Worth Public Schools

Financing Vocational Education 39

Alton D. Ice, Chairman

L. V. Ballard
Ben Dowd
Richard Hooker
Joe Mills
Luther Thompson

Evaluation of Vocational Education 47

Charles Jones, Chairman

Eugene C. Fisher
Texas A&M University

Techniques of Supervision 51

O. M. Holt
Mayor of College Station

Management of Vocational Education 55

J. B. Whiteley, Chairman

James Boone
Industrial Education
Texas A&M University

W. B. Mansfield
Texas Engineering Extension Service
Texas A&M University

Role of the Instructional Officer 58

Donald Clark, Chairman

William Knaak
Superintendent
Area Vocational-Technical Institute
St. Paul, Minnesota

III. CONFERENCE EVALUATION 64

PYRL SHOEMAKER

This is the period of time in which we need leadership in vocational education. Leadership is extremely hard to define. However, one might say that it is someone going some place and taking some people with you. Not long ago, the Department of Finance questioned our budget preparation. There seemed to be an inclination to cut out the portion designated for leadership. However, the best investment one can make is in people, and the best investment in people is in leadership. If there is to be progress in vocational education, there will have to be leadership. The quality and quantity of leadership must grow for vocational education to grow. This growth is important to our nation.

I have traveled in other countries and I have come to one conclusion. There is only one difference between the dollar bill and this sheet of paper. The difference is in what a person does in terms of productivity. It seems, throughout the world, that few places want the dollar. This is in contrast to the time when everyone wanted it and the people traveling outside this country carried dollars with them. In addition to this, the only American products seen in other countries visited were music and movies. The reason is that the other products used are made better and cheaper elsewhere. However, two American products were still highly marketed. These two are the American airplane and agricultural products.

There are no solutions to welfare through economic tricks. No president can improve the problem by national proclamation. The only answer lies in the productivity of us all. For example, our staff just received a raise in salary. The state superintendent, at a meeting, asked what we were going to do to earn that money. The longer we thought

about it the more sense it made. If one's productivity did not increase to earn that salary, then we were part of the problem and not the solution. The answer, therefore, rests in productivity. Vocational education is an important factor in the improvement of the productivity of youth and adults in this nation.

If we take a look at the growth rate of real output per employed person from 1929 to 1957, rechecked in 1967, we find it is 15 percent machines and 85 percent people. Moreover, the future of the industrial and business world of this nation rests with people, not machines. Here is a sad fact. For years and years the United States was number one in growth rate of real output per employed person. In one generation this was lost. Of the developed nations of the world, the United States is dead last in growth rate of real output per man hour. Japan is number one and Germany is number two. Interestingly, these countries have the two strongest currencies in the world.

There is one simple point of economics that I know and understand; there is no way on the face of this earth to produce less and get more. Only as we can compete on the world market with our goods and services, are we going to sell those on the world market. Likewise, only as we produce more can that price stay the same or go down. There must be a relationship between productivity, production, and what we can pay and will pay for the items. At present, only 5 percent of the jobs are in the unskilled range. In Ohio, there is actually about 12 percent of the jobs in the professional range. In another 10 years there may be 20 percent. This still means that 75 percent of the jobs in my state and likely in this nation require a vocational or technical education.

People, therefore, must receive vocational education if they are to enter, produce, and progress in a job in a modern technological society.

Now, regardless of what math one uses, the 75 percent referred to above is a majority. This does not deny the importance of a college education. I believe in college education. It does say, however, that for most young people, education has to be related to the labor market, in which 75% of the jobs are related to vocational or technical education. The price to be paid for this wonderful technological age is that of preparation for work. Employers are looking for people that have a skill and can "do" something. They don't care how much classical math or science a person has had. The weakness of our educational system manifests itself in the fact that the United States has the highest unemployment rate of any developed nation for young people of ages 18-21.

Leadership behavior, as mentioned, is hard to identify. A long time ago, someone would measure the knots on the head of a person and determine whether he was a leader or not. However, that did not work. So, they went beyond that in hiring people in the business. They looked at physique, the strong jaw, to determine leadership capability. This didn't work either. So, someone went to the halo concept of leadership. If a person was trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent, he must be a leader. Like the other ideas, this one failed too.

Finally, the Air Force, concerned with costly airplanes, got concerned with the leadership of the men flying them. What is this leadership? Frankly, they found out you can not define leadership. But they said let's examine leadership behavior. In the process, they took a look at a person required to exhibit leadership behavior in terms

of what the superiors think of that person, what he thinks of himself, and the person's evaluation by the subordinates. They had 16 traits they were trying to relate to good leadership behavior. When they finished evaluating the person in a leadership position through superiors, subordinates, and the man, they came up with only two significant factors. One was the ability to show consideration for the people with whom one works and second, the ability to "put the show on the road." When they found a person without these characteristics or deficient in one, he was headed for the "out" position. They did the same study with superintendents of schools and found that the same things apply. When a person was able to show consideration to the people, and at the same time "put the show on the road," he was identified by his board of education and by his teachers as exhibiting good leadership behavior. There is only one problem, however. We don't have the slightest idea how to develop these competencies in someone. We can tell you what they are, encourage you to develop them, but we don't know what kind of courses or what kind of experiences to direct you to get them.

Let's look, now, at some types of leaders exhibiting leadership behavior. Understanding these and yourself may give you some directions in terms of your leadership. One type of leader is the authoritarian. During his life or career he may be very successful. This individual knows where he's going and is going to have things his way. He makes the decisions and controls the process. Now, this isn't a bad man to work under. No one has to do any thinking. You don't have to accept any responsibility except for what he tells you to do. While this pattern has its limitations, the development will go no farther or faster than his capabilities will let it. So when he goes, the program tends to go.

Another type of leader is the laissez-faire. He's the individual who says "let it ride" and "don't rock the boat." You can never get an answer or a decision from this man. It's very frustrating because he's got his finger in the air to see which way the wind is blowing so he's not going to get caught on the wrong side of the wind.

Then there is the third type of leader; the democratic leader. I suppose we should cheer democratic leadership. It is probably the most creative type of leadership. However, there are some minor problems involved. For example, a graduate of Ohio State University, indoctrinated with Kimble Wiles' treatise on democratic leadership, became a principal in Marion, Ohio. He followed a principal who was a strict, authoritarian type person. The school was a fine operating school. If one walked in, there was not any paper in the halls, the teachers stood at the door when people passed, and there were no disruptions. However, teachers grumpled and complained all the time about the fact that this was a very undemocratic pattern of operation. They said they wanted a change. So, in comes this recent graduate from the graduate school of Ohio State imbued with the concept of democratic leadership. He immediately involved the faculty and the students in the matters of operating the school. He involved them in the development of policies and practices, and soon, he had utter chaos. Needless to say, he didn't return the next year.

Was he wrong in concepts of democratic leadership? No, he wasn't wrong. He didn't know how to lead democratically and many of the people really did not want democratic leadership at all. They wanted to run the school without knowing how to accept responsibility.

So, after this man moves, he will become a democratic manipulator. The next time, he will appoint an individual chairman of a committee who

thinks like he does. Then, when a report is submitted, he simply praises the committee for its recommendation because the report agrees with him. However, this is not democracy but rather, democratic manipulation.

A leader can use the creativity of the people he works with to solve policy and operational problems. They can help, however, with many aspects of leadership and development. There has to be commitment and skill on the part of the participants. We might ask the question - how do you improve the abilities of a group? John Bartky answers this by saying that when a person is assigned a leadership role, he needs to find out what kind of leadership role to which the people are accustomed and then, give them that kind of leadership until they are ready to accept the kind he wants to give. For example, if one goes into a group that has been used to the authoritarian type of leadership he better not move very fast until the group is ready, willing, and able to accept the responsibilities of democratic leadership.

There are several concepts one can use to prepare a group for democratic leadership. One of the concepts is the use of minor decisions. The purpose of this is to see if they are willing and able to participate in a give-and-take situation. Important to this is recognition of the voluntary leadership as it grows out of your group. Coupled with this, give them responsibility and a chance for involvement in a leadership role. There is, however, the possibility for tyranny of a minority. The loud person, under guise of democracy, who wants to force his ideas upon the group, is not participating in democratic leadership. For example, most of the time people prepare for committee meetings by putting on their hat and going. This seems to be especially true when

there is discussion or decisions to be made. A committee can be controlled if the person knows what the topic is and does some homework ahead of time. Try it sometime. Wait until the chairman opens the meeting and when ideas are requested, immediately start giving an idea along with an alternative idea. Everyone finally ends up deciding between the ideas that you brought up.

Did you ever see it happen? Anyone can do it. However, that isn't democracy in leadership either. If it happens in your group or organization, it is not a democracy. It isn't releasing the capability of your group at all. The pooling of ignorance is inexcusable. Likewise, pooling of indifference is just as bad. Therefore, skill in your leadership role depends upon how you can involve your staff, community, business, and industry in the decision making process.

One other study I would like to relate is in the area of leadership behavior. Industry concluded a study looking at the orientation of the leader. They asked such questions as "should the leader himself be a part of top management?" Does the leader feel that he is a part of the group responsible to the part of top management responsible for the group or between the two? Several conclusions were reached. The position which is utterly chaotic to the person is the one in which he positions himself between two groups - both top management and the group with whom he is responsible. In this position, his mental health may suffer. The second worst position is the one which he views himself as a part of top management responsible for that group. Here, he loses his rapport and relationship within the groups in terms of releasing any capabilities and leadership role in that group. According to the study, the best position for a person in a leadership role is to see himself

as a member of the group but a part of that group working to achieve the goals set forth by top management.

When I am given a job, that gives me the official designation. But I really don't get that job until the group that I'm working with tells me that I have it. Moreover, I've been in enough jobs to feel it. I can feel when the group finally decides that I have the job. Until that group decides that I have the job, all I do is run the shop. However, when they do decide I have this role responsibility then our work and efforts become productive. (I am proud to say that the staff and I in vocational education are part of the same outfit and I believe we are very productive. As long as I do my job and help them, all I need to do is get out of the way and let them go.) Remember, one can delegate authority but he can not delegate responsibility. For example, even though I give a man authority, it's my responsibility if anything happens in the shop.

The control of manpower and training of this nation should not go to a national organization under the Department of Labor. Since 1942, we have seen the Department of Labor almost become an educational agency under the three C's and NYA programs. Under NYA they set up vocational training schools and paid students to go there. The Department of Labor lost the NYA schools in 1945 by only three votes in Congress. They have never given up the idea, since that day, of again becoming a national education organization. They tried the manpower process and that didn't get them there. Now, the CETA is under the control of the Department of Labor. Likewise, they could nationalize the State Employment Service anytime they desire to.

Recently, an HEW position paper was released from Washington, D.C. and it was marked confidential. The paper actually began when President Ford was in Columbus, Ohio. He was exhorting the graduates and said that one of the things he believed in and supported was vocational education. He made a mistake. The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor got together with HEW and wrote a position paper called Career Education Towards the Third Environment. On the first page it talks about the importance of vocational training for people. Now let's proceed to page two. It says: In other respects related to job preparation, schools have come under increasing criticism. Although more vocational-technical courses are now directed at contemporary occupations, the proportion of enrollees trained in occupations with growing employment in such fields as health and technology is still very small. Here, too, the drop-out rate is high. More than half the graduates at the secondary level of vocational education take initial jobs in fields not related to the training and more than half are in unrelated jobs three years after graduation. Moreover, the earning of vocational-technical graduates is frequently no higher than those of dropouts. Statistics such as these have raised the question as to whether schools are the appropriate setting for learning relevant current job specific skills or whether such learning is better accomplished in the work place.

That isn't true in the state of Ohio. The Work in America book is an unsupported pulling together of old wives tales, which was obviously so unsound in terms of research that even the HEW wouldn't accept it. However, the position paper from the HEW says the same thing. It essentially says our programs are not effective, the students don't get jobs, they don't make any money, they are dropouts, and we question whether it is the proper setting for vocational training.

Now let's refer to another portion which states: "Evidence is accumulating that vocational education courses aimed at teaching specific job skills particularly at the secondary school level are not effective. Only about 55 percent of those taking health or office vocational training took first jobs in their area of training or in a highly related area. The proportion ranged down to 33 percent of those studying agriculture. Three years later the proportions were similar or less. Comparisions between those who take jobs with training, compared with those who do not, show a statiscally significant advantage to those whose jobs are highly related to their training." Again the same ideas from the Work in America book.

Now, to another part which emphasizes career education which leads to the model of the roles schools might take in the implementation of the "Third Environment." In other words, they say: "Get rid of vocational training at the high school level. The model we have called the third environment would combine the school and community resources to create a new environment for learning which would build on the strength of both. The schools would focus on those skills in which they have relative advantage, especially basic and prevocational skills." This statement means we should let the student sit until he's 18 before we teach him anything. This is the concept of industry controlled training of people. Furthermore, it's a regression to the European concept of industry controlled education for work. It didn't work in Russia. It hasn't worked in terms of the developing expanding industrial nations in the world. Sweden has gone to more in-school training for their youth and have, essentially, a vocational program very close to the

one we have in our nation. In view of the facts presented, I firmly believe there is a commitment by the HEW to give away vocational education to the other agencies of government.

During the last ten years in Ohio, we have spent 442 million dollars for physical facilities and equipment for vocational education mostly from state money. The people in Ohio would not spend that much money on a program if it was as bad as this report indicates. More than this, we have had the support of both a republican and democratic governor. The reason for this is that the vocational training for the students is worthwhile. It was producing enough for the youth that the state was willing to invest that kind of money. Furthermore, those promoting the "third environment" do not know what we are doing for adults. We served 250,000 adults last year in our public schools in Ohio and can't get attention to it. Now something is wrong and it may take an effort of youth organizations, of teachers and everything one can say to the congressman, to stop this effort to put vocational education in the Department of Labor.

I feel rather deeply about this. I'm frustrated because I've lived with it for 30 years. I've watched vocational education grow and build and provide services with national community and state support. We're up for national legislation and the stakes are high for the people and for the future of this nation. I believe that vocational education must stay under state and local control. Moreover, we need federal assistance for new developments and change. I happen to be very appreciative of those federal dollars we get, because they've helped us do the new and different. So, I plead with you. You are in a leadership role, not an

administrator. The future depends upon your vocational education efforts at the local levels. Each of us has a responsibility not only to the local community but to the program at the state level. And I say each of us has a responsibility not only to the local and state level but also to the national level through laws that will affect the future of vocational education.

JOE MILLS

I. Minimum Foundation Funding in Florida Prior to Weighted Pupil Approach

A. Salary, capital outlay, current expenses, and transportation in formula.
B. Based on teacher unit.
C. Provided for school unit for 27 students in attendance 180 days (adult education - 10).
D. Problems.
1. Speculation of double funding.
2. Question of funds reaching intended target programs.
3. Need for cost differentials for different vocational programs.

III. Solution to the Problems

A. Vocational education funding formula (1971, 1972).
1. Vocational students measured by the number of student contact hours.
2. Equipment, operation, other variables identified.
3. Added cost of job related courses, compensatory courses, and other courses for the disadvantaged and the handicapped identified.
4. Funding system for industrial arts.
5. The State Department of Education adopted procedures for earnings and allocation of these units.
B. Determining course costs.
1. Examine cost categories and FTE per course.
2. Key elements in operating costs.
a. Administration.
b. Instructional.
c. Physical plant operation.
d. Maintenance.
e. Auxiliary costs including transportation.
f. Fixed charges.
g. Depreciation.
h. Current operations from internal accounts.
3. Cost categories.

Vocational Education
"The Florida Education Finance Act of 1973"
Vocational and Adult Education Cost Factors

Cost Category	Vocational Technical Program	Weight
I	Vocational Education	4.26
II	Vocational Education	2.64
III	Vocational Education	2.18
IV	Vocational Education	1.69
V	Vocational Education	1.40
VI	Vocational Education	1.17

Special Adult General Education Programs

Adult Basic Education and Adult High School	=	1.60
Community Services Education	=	1.30

Vocational Courses
Six (6) Cost Categories

Cost Category	Types of Courses	Weighted Avg. Cost Per FTE 1972-73	No. FTE Students to Earn one MFP Unit
I	Regular courses and courses for handicapped students	$2,155	8
II	Regular courses and courses for disadvantaged students	1,500	11
III	Regular courses	1,109	14
IV	Regular courses	958	16
V	One-half day Coop-Ed courses	--	
VI	Full day Coop-Ed courses	--	

C. Legislative influence.
1. Established limitation on vocational funding, to insure costs were not excessive. Funds remaining distributed based upon needs.
2. Limit established; 25 hours per weeks per student.
3. Night classes included in funding formula.

RICHARD HOOKER

The governor, during the last session of the legislature, found himself in an uncomfortable situation. He was aware that the state was spending half of its dollars on some form of public education. He also knew that over 500 bills dealing directly or indirectly with education were before the legislature at that time. His discomfort was caused by the fact that he had no staff to assist him in positioning himself to act as a liaison with the educational community. Consequently, by executive decree, he decided to establish a Governor's Office of Educational Research and Planning. It was to be a small staff to help him through some of the issues of public education and position himself as the state's chief executive, responsible for program and budget planning.

We were asked to join the staff and begin planning for the development of the office in July. The staff became operational last November 1. Our first job was to review most of the finance research in Texas to identify a "laundry list" of areas of inquiry and carry these areas to various elements of the governmental and educational community. We then began to form cooperative relationships with many of these education organizations. They would inform us of the type program they were to undertake so the staff could use the information to set up time lines with them. In this way, there will be no duplicating of efforts. As a result, we function this year as a research and design organization.

The staff worked together in describing what the broad educational program ought to be in the 1980's. After deciding this, it began examining which finance system would best facilitate that program.

There are several characteristics that flow through this curriculum

description. The first is individualized instruction. The staff feels that individualized instruction needs to become a reality for all students. Another essential point is career education starting at K and going through adulthood with the assumption that adults need training to adjust to a changing economy. The assumption was so strong that they felt 90% of our students should be involved in vocational technical education at the high school level. The final concern was the need for flexibility in staffing (differential staffing); the development of new patterns of serving and meeting the needs of students.

Therefore, to begin to shape and develop the concepts of what the funding does, one needs to look at the models that are in existence. The weighted pupil format, which has just been discussed, offers a great deal in providing a foundation for moving forward with the development of these kinds of programs. It changed the focus from the teacher and the teacher needs to the student and the student needs. It is felt this is a good change; a change both the legislature and public will agree with. The weighted pupil approach is very responsive and recognizes the cost differentials associated with meeting the different needs of students. We all recognize the fact that meeting the needs of certain types of youngsters, such as the orthopedically handicapped, is terribly expensive. However, we must realize our obligation to educate that youngster and offer him a quality program. Therefore, we need to implement a program that is responsive to the needs of all students. Likewise, the weighted pupil approach is very responsive to the lack of uniformity in the incidence of youngsters needing high cost programs. For example, some school districts have a much greater need for high cost programs than others. Hence, the weighted pupil system, focusing

upon what that pupil needs in a program, allows us to flow money and put it where those needs are. The weighted pupil approach also allows us to avoid the double counting. However, I defended it during the last session of the legislature and I'll defend it again in terms of our present minimum school foundation program. Ours is a very low level program that does not provide any quality education opportunity without the local school district providing a supplement in terms of local enrichment funds. This double counting, since it is a type of weighting, helps provide funds. (However, it is not as refined as an FTE approach.) Another factor that makes the weighted pupil approach desirable is that it provides an easier way for the policy maker to see what's happening to the money. Hence, if he wants to stimulate programs in career education, he can change the weights and place incentives in the fund flow system for the development of such programs. He does not need an expert on foundation school program to help him intervene.

In terms of taxpayer equity in Texas, we are forced with the situation in which half of the dollars we spend on public education flow through an equalization framework. We are spending about 3 billion dollars this year and the cost of the school foundation program will be about 1.5 billion dollars. This means that the foundation school program does not provide a quality educational opportunity. Moreover, local districts are enriching the base of a local tax well. Therefore, in a community that is fortunate enough to have industrial or mineral wealth, it can spend high amounts of money to supplement the foundation program because of low taxes. However, if the case is just the opposite, there is still a small amount of money to that community. In a court case involving

these factors, the supreme court established physical neutrality to judge whether or not the school finance system was, in fact, constitutional. This simply means that the state will allow for equal opportunity to spend within school districts. In other words, the state will offset the disparities in local taxable wealth in a provision of educational programs in local school districts.

From a theoretical point of view, there are two basic ways to respond to this. The first is a one hundred percent state funding of the foundation school program. Today, in Texas, we appropriate approximately a billion dollars a year from the local tax for support of elementary and secondary education. In addition, all the major research groups that have addressed the problem of school finance in Texas developed recommendations that would call for increased fundings and annual expenditures to public education of approximately a billion dollars. Therefore, adding the two requires the state to appropriate two billion dollars for a full state funding program. The other alternative is a power equalization program. This means the state will assure that the school districts could spend at a given level per pupil for a given level of effort. In a pure sense, the state would fix this level on an average and the school district that raised more than the average would give the extra to the state for extension to the less fortunate districts. This, of course, would not be feasible either. Therefore, we have come to the conclusion that we need to utilize a weighted pupil approach to flow an adequate number of dollars to school districts based on the needs of the student.

In addition to the weighted pupil approach, a decision needs to be made on state-local sharing of the cost of this foundation school program based on the ad valorem tax well of the local school district. The ad valorem

tax in Texas today has a local option tax. The people do whatever they want to with no uniformity or appraisal guidelines. Therefore, in getting this all to determine the taxable property values, there must be some single factor to direct us. The idea of a market value single factor indexed for the distribution of state funds to local school districts is not new to us. Every major research group that has ever addressed this problem in Texas recommended that we go to a market value approach for determining or estimating the wealth of local school districts and equitably flowing funds. Therefore, if the local school district's only revenue source is the ad valorem tax, there is only one fair way to determine local school districts' ability to acquire the revenue. This would be by direct measure of the tax base.

BEN DOWD

We are definitely considering, at this point, the weighted pupil approach to funding. However, cost determination is not settled and we need suggestions as to the best strategy for this. We do have some data, though, from our analysis of the 42 school districts Dr. Hooker mentioned earlier. These 42 districts were selected by the education profession through ballots. They voted on two "model" school districts in six census categories given them. The votes were then tallied and 150 school districts chosen. A second balloting reduced it such that 42 districts were selected. Even though it may seem that 42 school districts is not many out of 1117, we found that these 42 districts accounted for 42% of the students in the state of Texas. After selecting these districts, visits were made to determine the actual contact time the child had per week in a program to assist in finding FTE factors. TEA took over here and coupled teachers with classes and expenses, with the exception of federal money, transportation, and debt service. Then a costing of the program was determined.

With the help of Forbis Jordan from the University of Florida, the costs per FTE were determined. Since our definition of an FTE is a six hour day, or 30 hours per week, a student gets 1/6th of the money for being in a school related program for one hour. It is important to note that school districts which conduct a school day of a different duration than this also can be accommodated. Our highest cost index is 2.63. However, this value will fluctuate. In view of this, one of the values of the FTE is its flexibility if there is a change in the flow of funds. In addition, these FTE figures are unweighted because between programs the

cost per student will vary. Therefore, Spearman's weighted average counted as much as Dallas'. This seemed to give an equal input between small and larger districts. So, then, the weights would be the money to flow for a child in a program with an FTE of one.

After compiling this data, several options were presented. First, until there is a hands-on cost analysis, there would be a flow of funds to all vocational programs at an index reflecting appropriate weights for the specific vocational program. For example, if a student is in a program with an index of 2.5, one hour per day, there would be 155% more money provided to the school without federal money or local enrichment. Moreover, if the student is in his program two hours per day, there would be an increase of 327% compared to present funding.

There are several reasons behind this. First of all, the Governor is as firmly committed to the concept of career education as we are. By that, the implication would be that the student should learn a salable skill, not only from an economic point of view, but from the concept that vocational skills improve the whole person as well. This is the aspect in which you, through the vocational program, can add more of the dimension than anyone else. Secondly, the program has to be flexible enough so that any cost differentials that are not on the plus side now, can be renegotiated throughout the year. To make all this necessary, there must be accurate record keeping.

ALTON ICE

The principal concern of the State Advisory Council is to develop a delivery system that provides a comprehensive offering of technical vocational education that prepares the student for a job. This, of course, brings to mind two factors: the needs of the individual and the needs of the economy.

From its very beginning, the council began to make evaluations. Due to the fact that a rather large group of people was needed to justify comprehensiveness of offerings, the council evaluated criteria from Texas and other states to facilitate the grouping of people for this purpose. The conclusion was that the minimum number would be 15,000 K-12 scholastics, which is a population of about 50,000. This comes to be about 1500 high school students necessary to offer a minimum of 15 programs. The students, then, would be collectively gathered in a jurisdiction within a 40 minute radius of the central facility. With these deductions, it would take a $40,000,000 property evaluation to support it.

In view of the fact that there are 188 counties with less than 1500 students, there must be an overlapping of county boundaries to secure the necessary resources. The council recommended jurisdictions, in which there will be some overlapping of school districts. Futhermore, there ought to be a matching of state-local funds to allow local districts to take part in the area schools. There have been bills before the legislature dealing with this. However, there has been little support so far. This may be partially due to the council's failure to completely make the point. Some states are already responding to this type system. For

example, Tennessee conducted a state-wide needs analysis and computed a need of 200 million dollars. The legislature voted for this and they are developing these area schools. Texas conducted a survey to determine how much enrollment in area schools comes from outside the district. The study revealed that less than 5% came from outside the district. It seems that area schools are functioning to serve the students in a particular campus or district. The council does not feel that this is the kind of delivery system to provide the offerings mentioned.

In this regard, there are several alternatives to establishing a relationship between the job market and programs we are offering. One suggestion, that did not succeed, was to present a bill before the legislature. Apparently, the council failed to make the point. However, another possible route would be a success model. This would consist of a demonstration of a model jurisdiction within the state. This, too, has limitations because of the lcak of facilities required to accommodate the students. The other possible alternative is that the state board should conduct a state wide needs assessment. This would involve establishing proposed jurisdiction. The people are in complete agreement with this type situation until they come to the point of how much money to put into it. The concept is fine. However, we have not dealt with the people in specific proposals involving definite people in specific areas of geography.

In Texas, education has lots of things in its favor. Money is being appropriated to education and provisions made for education. However, there may be a need to ask ourselves if we are accomplishing what needs to be done, without an "area school system." The council feels that there needs to

be such a system and supports it. To do the best, though, there needs to be input from the directors and administrators.

LUTHER THOMPSON

The information to be presented to you is facts. These facts have been collected from the division of the Texas Education Agency. Hopefully, these will examine some problems of the local planners and administrators.

I'd like to add to some of the comments that Mr. Ice has made relative to an administrative arrangement for delivery of vocational service. The TEA agency and its staff are doing business with better than 1100 public school districts. In addition, there are 47 public junior colleges, over 20 senior colleges, 4 campuses of Texas State Technical Institutes, 20 education service centers, over 200 private schools, and over 20 special schools for which we provide technical assistance, funding, and leadership. As of this date, there are over 110 public school districts that are functioning as area schools, and Texas State Technical Institute. Within commuting distance of less than 50 miles from these facilities, we can reach over 95% of the total population of this state. Regardless of what type of criteria you may apply for allocating dollars or approving the area school concept for a local unit, the people continue to concentrate in the metropolitan areas of counties along the lower valley. As a result, certain sections of East Texas, West Texas, and North Texas are not building programs. The main reason for this is because there is no taxable wealth.

In Texas, financing starts with the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 that was program centered. However, the most recent legislation focuses on the needs of the people. This is significant because we can focus on the teacher rather than the student. With this in mind, the local administrator has a problem when he must provide for the variety of needs of the students in terms of a program plan supported by a financial plan.

Now this aspect is not complex when done at the lowest unit of government. However, if done at the state level, it becomes more complex and will have to address certain issues. One of the main issues is that of the taxable wealth per student in this state. Certainly, the wealth in one district will vary from that of another district. Another issue is local control versus state control. In addition, there is the issue of supplement versus supplant. In other words, every one wants service as long as somebody else pays for it. It is very easy for most people to identify the population and the service which will provide some outcome through the educational process. However, when considering the elements of quality, there is no clear cut measure. Another issue is the organizational structure of a public school district. It seems, now, the trend is from a single campus district to a multiple campus district. (So, in this regard, consideration has to be given to different administrative service in terms of a supportive and administrative service required to carry out the everyday operation of schools.) A final consideration is the level of funding. It is very easy to finalize a program plan and a budget. However, I think the reason for our meeting today is to find out who is going to pay the bill.

Now, the local administrator has to look at all elements of cost. The local planner and administrator has so many expenses to think about. To take care of these, he has money from the local, state, and federal level. The question is, then, how does the local planner treat these services. So far, at the state level, TEA has only examined part of the total school program at any one time. Somehow, the agency has neglected to consider the total program and financial pattern required for a local planner to discharge his duties.

Most of you are knowledgeable of the foundation program. In the current year, 1974, a sizable amount of state resources are going into the foundation program. During this time, some education bills have been introduced into the legislation. As a result, new costs have been incurred, such as educational television, computer services, and some special programs. However, if one looks at the total cost of the program, he will find that a major portion of the cost is for teachers' salaries. To cope with this, House Bill 240, Senate Bill 230, and House Bill 263 were passed and authorized dollars to be paid from the foundation program fund over a period of several years.

Since we have a program that authorizes dollars and is people oriented, it might be profitable to note the personnel in the program. Up to this time, we have considered only those personnel paid from foundation funds. However, there are some personnel delivering service who are not paid with foundation funds. If we look at the total personnel in relation to the ADA, the total number of personnel is increasing at a faster rate than the increase of people to be served. The reason for this is that additional services have been added to hopefully enhance the quality of education. However, this has increased cost as well. So, then, it is debatable as to whether or not the productivity is increasing or decreasing.

The state computed, using current expenditures, the average per pupil cost. In 1974-75, with 2.5 million dollars ADA, the per pupil cost was less than 900 dollars per year. However, when all the costs incurred by the local education agency were added, the amount was raised to 1200 dollars per pupil (this amount includes the total cost amount). A financial study was

completed showing the importance of federal funds in the cost sharing mode. However, nothing is stable at this point in terms of amount of federal money because there is no decision as to what type federal program to be implemented.

The state of Texas has been administering its program of vocational education under the 1968 amendment. This meant that if Texas wanted to use the money appropriated on the public law 90-576, it had to appoint an advisory council. This came to be with the Technical-Vocational Act of 1969. This sets forth the function, duties, and responsibilities of the advisory council in relation to the state board for vocational education and the state plan. In the preparation of a state plan, particularly in the financing of the public school vocational programs, we must consider state legislation. Senate Bill 261, I just mentioned, created the advisory council. House Bill 263 modified the former Gilmer-Akin Legislation relating to the funding of vocational education. This was really a milestone in terms of the previous legislation and made reference to types of teacher unit, such as industrial, homemaking, and agriculture. However, in this bill, it mentioned only 3 types of vocational units; a teacher unit, a counselor unit, and a supervision unit. At this point, there is a deviation from earlier legislation of the Smith-Hughes, George Barden, and other amendments. Of course, previously mentioned, House Bill 240 was a foundation program. In the 62nd legislative session, Senate Bill 189 provided money for a district to pay for contracted services. This provided the school district the authority and financial support to contract with its neighbor for a service that would benefit some of the students enrolled in the sending school district. In the 63rd session, House Bill 1162 provided

the transportation of certain vocational students interdistrict and intradistrict. In addition, HCR 77, which has been labeled as career education, did nothing more than to extend vocational services to the 7th and 8th grade.

At the state level, we are looking in terms of some projections for growth. Of course, we have a very good historical base that has been established over many years. Naturally, it seems, some are very impatient in terms of growth, while others are more conservative. However, a very important and real aspect to this is space. It became necessary to face the fact that space limits one's growth to provide the type vocational education service one wants. Even if a district has the space, it may not be at the point in time at which it can implement the service. This, in turn, becomes a problem when the state level personnel attempt to work cooperatively with a local administrator. The local administrator is much more aware of his needs and they are actually more acute than the state level planner realizes.

Let's take a look at projected fund requirement here. In the state plan, there is a schedule referred to as Table 6, in which the state's cost sharing mode is discussed. In that table, federal, state, and local resources are examined. It is extremely difficult to fix any of these at any one time because of the variables involved in terms of matching funds at the state level. For example, federal money may be appropriated under the 68th amendment that has a matching requirement. If the state did not match the money, the districts could only qualify for the money if they had a need and could match the federal money with local money. So, then, it is a situation in which some programs have money available, while others face tremendous shortages of local dollars. An

important point, here, is that the school districts with the greatest need have already committed their local resources. Therefore, these problems, taken collectively over the state, present a tremendous job for the state.

In addition to the foundation program of funding, the state is aided by federal dollars. The present budget of federal funds for the current year of 1975 is about 9.7 million dollars. Of that amount, 5.6 million dollars will be allocated for secondary instruction. This money under secondary instruction will be spent for costs not covered under the foundation program. For example, it covers travel for teacher units, hardware costs, instructional equipment expenses, adult instruction, and guidance and counseling. As for funding these after changing the present funding system, the problem will have to be worked out. However, before anyone begins to shape and develop a proposal, a good look needs to be made of the strengths and weaknesses of the present system and of the proposed financial plan.

DALLAS ATOR

Byrl Shoemaker and others during the conference talked about the conflicts of location of vocational education priorities. Vocational education will enjoy a higher priority, at least in the next biennium, on a national, regional, and state level than it ever has before. To support this idea, I will refer to President Ford's address to Ohio State University's summer graduating class. He said "The question that is in most young peoples' mind today is this: How can I get a job that makes sense, as well as money?" President Ford continued with these remarks: "Your professors tell you that education unlocks creative genius and imagination and that you must develop your human potential and students have excepted this. But then Catch 22 enters the picture. You spend 4 years in school, graduate, go into the job market, and are told that the rules have changed. There is no longer a demand for your speciality. Another educational discipline is now required and so one or two years of study inevitably follows and then you return to the job market. Yes, what you now offer is salable, except the competition is very tough. To succeed you must acquire further credentials. So you go back to the university and ultimately emerge with the master's or even a doctor's degree and you know what happens next? You go out and you look for a job and now they say you're over qualified. In one form or another this is a three shell game. Our society has been playing tricks with their greatest natural energy source. That is you, Miss, Mr. Graduate, and this has got to be stopped. And the president went on to remark that although this administration will not make promises it cannot keep, I do want to pledge one thing to you here and now. I will do everything in my power to bring education and employers together in a new climate of

credibility; an atmosphere in which universities turn out scholars and employers turn them on. Ever since President Abraham Lincoln initiated the concept of the land grant colleges set up to bring pupil and students closer to the land, the federal government has been interested in the practical application of education. I proposed a great new partnership of labor and educators. Why can't the universities of America open their doors wide to working men and women; not only just students? Practical problem solvers can contribute much to education whether or not they hold a degree. I want to see labor open its ranks to researchers and the problem solvers of the campus, whose research can give better tools and methods to the work movement. I want to see a two way street speeding the traffic of scientific developments, speeding the creation of new jobs, speeding the day of self sufficiency in energy, and speeding an era of increased production for America." And I'll conclude his remarks with these words: What good is training if it is not applied to jobs? What good are factories if they are shut down? What good is business and industry without those who solve their problems, perform jobs, and spend their paychecks? Well I think it's obvious nationally that vocational education is going to receive a high priority and already has in those educational laws and acts that have been passed by this congressional session. For example, about two-thirds of the money named in those laws and acts has been specifically identified for various vocational kinds of educational support. The question is, where in the bureaucracy of our nation is the leadership of these problems really going to fall?

The problem to discuss is determining of operational definitions and program implications regarding the correlation of three programs. These

must be specifically identified, clearly defined, and conveyed to the public. The three programs that need to be clarified and identified are career education, vocational education, occupational/technical education. At the federal level, definitions are beginning to emerge. Some states have clarified, to a degree, the differences. However, very few local district plans have specifically clarified the domains of these three areas. This defining of areas, though, is not meant to infer that barriers are to be built between them. First, Hoyt defines career as the totality of work one does in his or her lifetime. Thus any person can have only one career. That career typically begins prior to entering kindergarten and continues well into the retirement years. Adding career, in that context, to education, Hoyt says career education consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about work. As such, it makes no restrictions in meaning between the work of the homemaker, the musician, the lawyer, or the bricklayer. To the extent the work is judged successful, some work will require advanced college degrees, while other work may require no former schooling of any kind. However, jobs typically and increasingly require some learned set of vocational skills. In defining vocation, he refers to it as one's primary work role at any given point in time. Vocations, however, include paid employment as well as unpaid work roles. For example, we can speak of the vocation of the student, the full-time volunteer worker, or the full-time homemaker just as easily as we can speak about the vocation of a plumber, the physician, or the engineer. Then, linking that to education in a program sense, he says vocational education consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about a primary work role. Therefore, this definition includes all kinds of primary work roles; paid and unpaid.

This differs markedly from the definition currently in use by the American Vocational Association but seems to better define the word. Finally, he refers to occupational/technical as one's primary work role of paid employment. Economic returns are always considered among the work values of persons engaged in occupations, even though they may not be by persons in certain vocations. The occupations of many persons will be synonymous with their vocations. One may have a vocation without begin engaged in an occupation but he can never have an occupation without having a vocation. Linking that concept, then, to educational programs, he says occupational education consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns to work in the world of paid employment. Regardless of whether these are accepted or not, there must be some clarification for the staff as well as the public.

The second problem is a clash between school programs of occupational exploration and vocational training, and training programs in the trades. For example, recently, a joint apprenticeship training committee for painters, decorators, and day wall installers has contracted with the best competency base developers in the country for training programs. They have contracted for a curriculum development program for their trainees. Their thrust is management and labor. Moreover, industry, to sell its products, will certainly join with them. These apprenticeship training committees are made up of equal representation from management. Consequently, their linkage with business and industry presents us with a very serious problem.

The last problem is the assessment of local program by assessing the district and the program, then matching the two sets of data. What is needed is that kind of continual evaluation that should be provided every

program at the grass root level. For example, the center worked last year with six large school districts in our nation, in terms of helping them to plan for improved vocational education programs. Our first step was to grasp what was expected of the programs by the community. Then, in turn, it was necessary to find what the program participants and leaders in the schools expected. After determining these, the two pictures were compared. Surprisingly, the communities in five of the six instances had an entirely different list of priorities than did those involved in the vocational programs. Fortunately, the school personnel had recognized this and were trying to cope with that problem. Another interesting factor, was the review of these six programs. In every district, in every program, the methodological and the technical knowledge, devices, and facilities were from 3 to 15 years behind industry.

From the national advisory council, this was the closing remark of a report sent to the president on September, 1974: Vocational education now exists to educate people to appreciate, practice, and extend all of the arts of career education. Without vocational education as an integral part of career education people can neither participate in our culture nor share in its rewards. What we most need now is action. We have provided an unmistakable sense of direction. We now need a united, cohesive effort to make career education happen in which all the arts of education are integrated. Frankly, the committee is getting tired of the endless talk of change. We are tired of all of the studies that simply restate the need for change. We're getting tired of the exhortation to change and start changing. We must come to understand the processes which permit us to plan the kind of changes we know are absolutely essential. We must repeal irrelevance in American education. We believe the concepts of career education will move us toward that urgent enterprise. Vocational

supervisors and administrators in Texas, the challenge is yours. The conference has pointed out to you desperate needs in your profession; some new, some old. However, change for the sake of change is not good. If it is to occur on a positive objective, it must start with you in the local programs. It is up to you as vocational administrators and supervisors to initiate that change. The challenge is yours.

REPORT FROM SECTION ON - COMMUNITY RELATIONS - Gabe Dooley, Chairman

This report includes a summary of the following speakers on the above subject, Wednesday and Thursday, October 9-10, 1974:

Mrs. Jean Nipper
Houston Public Schools

Dr. Betty Herring
Fort Worth Public Schools

Recorders were:

Mrs. Lois Trahan, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mrs. Edith Bullock, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mr. Craig Morton, Graduate Assistant, TAMU

Public relations in education deals with local, state, national, and international aspects of bridging the gap between educational and non-educational factions. The emphasis today is on the local level.

Mrs. Nipper - "Image"

The image of vocational education is important in a community. It seems that problem children are placed in vocational programs. In addition vocational facilities are often divorced from the rest of the facilities. This tends to hurt the image of a vocational program. To overcome a bad image and create a good one, the vocational programs must work together as a family. If the local program is a success, then state, national, and international programs will consequently fall in line.

To do this, several publics are stated and defined. One public is the internal public. Internal publics are defined as groups of people within the family of education or directly associated with the school system such as students, teachers, parents, administrators, counselor, school board, and auxiliary personnel. The external public is defined as groups of people who are outside of the family or have indirect relation-

ships with the school system such as business, industry, professionals, civic organizations, churches, taxpayers, law enforcement officials, community leaders, news media, vendors, colleges, legislative leaders, and labor unions. Through seminar group decision, the top four internal publics (ideally) were: (1) students, (2) administrators, (3) parents, (4) teachers. The top four priority external publics (ideally) were: (1) business, industry, and professionals, (2) media, (3) former students, and (4) government.

The following program for vocational education orientation was discussed:

> Assemble a slide-tape of each program of approximately five minutes in length. Have the vocational students present handout brochures. In the spring sponsor a project show from each vocational program. Co-op could develop displays with pictures on-the-job.

A film featuring Louie Welch and expressing the need for vocational education in our schools was shown and the groups voted in favor of presenting this film for showing at the general assembly Thursday morning.

REPORT FROM SECTION ON - FINANCING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION - Alton D. Ice, Chairman

This report includes a summary of the following speakers and resource persons on the above subject, Wednesday and Thursday, October 9-10, 1974, general session and three discussion groups:

Mr. Joe Mills, Director, Vocational Education, Tallahassee, Florida
Dr. Richard Hooker, Director, Governor's Office of Education Research and Planning, Austin, Texas
Dr. Ben Dowd, Director of Planning, Governor's Office of Education Research and Planning, Austin, Texas
Mr. L. V. Ballard, Director, Public School Occupational Programs Division
Mr. Luther Thompson, Director, Division of Occupational Service and Development
Mr. Alton D. Ice, Executive Director, The State Advisory Council for Technical Vocational Education

Recorders were:

Mr. Gerald Bekker, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mrs. Florence Hood, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mr. Ed Binder, EPDA Fellow, TAMU

MR. JOE MILLS

Mr. Mills reported that Florida was on a minimum foundation program from 1947 until last year when they started the Weighted Pupil Funding approach. Florida has 67 Countywide school districts. The principals function much like the Independent School District Superintendent in Texas.

Under the Florida Minimum Foundation Program 27 students and 10 adults are the basis for allocation of a vocational unit. Many people were of the opinion that under the Minimum Foundation Program vocational units were enjoying double funding. We considered it differential funding, or a form of weighting for the extra costs of vocational education. The State Legislature wanted to trace the money from the Legislature to the students and to establish cost effectiveness.

Associated Consultants in Education (ACE) were contracted to do a statewide study on cost of education and area schools in particular. The elements of cost included (1) administration at the county and local school

levels, (2) salaries of certified and non-certified personnel, (3) textbook materials, (4) instructional resources, (5) expenses of instruction, (6) teacher education, (7) physical plant, (8) maintenance of building, (9) auxiliary services-transportation, food services, etc., (10) fixed charges-bonded indebtedness, etc., (11) depreciation of equipment-1/10th per year, and (12) internal accounts.

Florida started 5 years ago on a Management Information System, with special attention given to inventory of facilities, resources, and costs. Differentials were: Vocational Education Category #1 = 4.26, #2 = 2.64, #3 = 2.18, #4 = 1.69, #5 = 1.40, #6 = 1.17; Adult Basic Education 1.6; and Community Services 1.3. Cost breakouts were 52 percent for salaries; 11 percent for education materials, travel, equipment, etc.; 16 percent for general school center costs; and 10 percent for districtwide service costs. Grades 4 through 10 were at 1.00.

Florida has given up in getting meaningful guidance services, and is employing occupational placement and follow-up specialists. Ten million dollars were used for these services and they are very effective. A special fund for six million dollars was appropriated for updating equipment.

A legislative committee has been surveying local districts to determine how the system is working and they determined that:

A. The good points of the system are:

1. The double funding charge is gone.
2. Education is directed toward the needs of students.
3. Local autonomy in planning and management is maintained.

B. The liabilities of the system:

1. Flow of dollars to local school districts.
2. A large part of money went to salaries.
3. Not all of the money is going to categories for which it was intended.

4. There should be some reserve for capitalization of equipment.
5. The time for implementation was too short.

The Legislature mandated a flow of 90 percent of earned funds to the program that earned them. Now, the Legislature is being encouraged to reduce this to 70 percent.

DR. RICHARD HOOKER

In July, 1973 the Governor formed an Office of Educational Research and Planning which became operational in November, 1973 to help the Governor think through education issues facing the state. Cooperative relationships were developed with groups and agencies.

The Minimum Foundation Program is outdated because it pays only one-half of expenditures; recognizes cost differentials only through widely criticized double counting and through the assumption that there is a uniform incidence of students needing high cost programs; and it makes teachers and their needs the center of funding system.

The Weighted Pupil Foundation Program tries to:

1. Make students and their needs the center of funding system.
2. Recognize the cost differentials associated with meeting the varying needs of students through the use of weights.
3. Respond to the lack of uniformity in the district-to district incidence of students needing high cost programs.
4. Avoid double counting through a full-time equivalent pupil approach to pupil accounting for funding purposes.
5. Make policy intervention in the school finance system easily.

DR. BEN DOWD

The Governor's Office is committed to the Weighted Pupil System, but nothing is "cut in concrete" at this point. In order to get a basis for study, a group of 42 representative Independent School Districts were selected. Several groups were involved in the selection of these 42 School Districts which represented 42 percent of the student population

of the state. Visitations were made to the exemplary districts. Cost and other data for 1972-73 were examined.

Small school districts represent only 4 percent of students of Texas. Special accommodations will have to be made for school districts in sparse areas. There will have to be a "save harmless" clause.

The main items included in the Weighted Pupil Foundation Program (WPFP) would be those presently in the Minimum Foundation Program (MFP). They are:

1. Salaries of teachers.
2. Instructional costs.
3. Maintenance and operation.
4. Administrative costs.

Those items not included in the Weighted Pupil Foundation Program are:

1. Transportation.
2. Debt service.
3. Federal funds.

MR. ALTON D. ICE

Mr. Ice reported on funded proposals for Area Schools. The Advisory Council has been charged with developing a plan for area schools in the state and has made recommendations on the subject since its first report. The proposals were submitted to the legislature in 1971 and 1973, but have not been enacted. There is presently on the statute books provisions for countywide area schools. However, in using a minimum of 1500 high school average daily attendance as a minimum, 188 of the state's 254 counties have less than 1500 high school average daily attendance, while 30 have 1500 to 3000 high school average daily attendance and 34 counties have in excess of 3,000 high school average daily attendance.

The council suggested the following criteria for minimum standards for information of area school jurisdictions:

1. Minimum of 15,000 Scholastics (K-12), 50,000 Population, or 1500 High School Average Daily Attendance.

2. Forty minute radius from any centralized facility.
3. Minimum of $40 million in property evaluation.
4. A maximum of 20¢ per $100 assessed property tax.
5. A minimum of 15 vocational programs.

Even though the state has 105 secondary institutions, less than 5% of the enrollment in secondary area schools are from another campus or district. Nearly 40 percent of the districts do not have cooperative agreements with neighboring districts.

The major objections to the proposed legislation have been the jurisdictions of governance and taxing. The following possible alternatives were proposed:

1. Proceed with legislative proposals.
2. Develop a model demonstration jurisdiction.
3. Explore the effect of intensive coordination/leadership.
4. Statewide needs assessment and recommendations to the Legislature.

MR. JOE MILLS STATED:

1. There are fewer supervisory personnel in Florida.
2. Big city superintendents in Florida want some categorization of funds.
3. The state staff has an adult role in vocational education.
4. The local director deals with local principal who is the program manager.
5. Last year Florida had 19.2 percent growth in vocational education, this year 22 percent.
6. Guidance counselors in Florida were not doing the job, so we have Occupational Specialists.
7. There has been some proselyting to fill courses.
8. Florida has a 10 year limit on certification of teachers.
9. There is a need to do a better job on cost analysis.
10. There is a need to look at what it takes to do the job.
11. The role of local vocational director will be more persuasive than in past.
12. The area schools are being strengthened under the system.
13. Facilities are provided by federal funds.
14. The Legislature provided $95 million for facilities in state.
15. Most schools are revamping present facilities.

16. Construction should be based on pupil space needs and program needs.
17. We need to resolve reserve funds for replacement of equipment, (Government does not normally develop reserve funds for such purposes).
18. Administrators are in more of a "buyer's market" regarding teachers, and can be more selective; however, Florida is short of Agricultural Teachers.
19. Five percent of the funds were "earmarked" for in-service education for vocational teachers.

MR. LUTHER THOMPSON

Mr. Thompson reviewed data and information on the various aspects of vocational education and financing of programs. Post-secondary technical-vocational education programs have been under a student contact hour formula system since 1969. It was reported that travel for vocational students (Transportation) for 1973-74 amounted to only $251,831. Travel must be performed in a school owned vehicle in order to be reimbursed. This can be a stationwagon, van, or regular school bus. The travel budget for vocational units in the state for 1974-75 is 4.4 million.

Mr. Ballard listed the following items that would be funded outside the WPFP (Perhaps from Federal Funding):

1. Adult Education.
2. Building and equipment.
3. Travel.
4. State Administration.
5. Materials development.
6. Pilot and demonstration projects.
7. Research.
8. Contracting.

The following questions and concerns were voiced concerning Weighted Pupil Foundation Program:

1. <u>What will be the role of TEA as far as program standards are concerned</u>?

   The TEA's role will continue, especially in the area of accountability.

2. Will legislation have teeth to assure that dollars are spent for programs?

   It will be assured by audits against the standards.

3. Why change from what we are now doing?

   We have a mandate from the courts to equalize educational opportunity--WPFP will flow funds to students against their needs not against needs of other aspects of education.

   There is presently an imbalance between districts to provide education.

   The WPFP will attempt to bring floor up but not put a ceiling on districts.

   The market value will balance local fund assignment of districts as opposed to present economic index.

   The additional funds for education (500 million) will elicit a mandate from the people to address in education.

Other comments included:

1. The Weighted Pupil Foundation Program would not protect tenure and salary schedule, but TSTA has a strong position on this.

2. Dr. Dowd sees more visibility for local directors of Vocational Education, as they will be developing programs that bring in 2½ times the dollars as regular programs.

3. There would have to be a Sparsity Index, and a 50% incentive for consolidation for those districts that are in a position to consolidate.

4. What type of system will be used to give credit to vocational agriculture teachers and others with responsibilities in adult education, young farmers and young homemakers, project supervision, youth organizations, etc.?

5. Governor wants strong accountability on present and/or proposed funding.

6. There is concern about vocational education dollars being utilized for capital outlay.

7. Probably all aspects of CVAE would be funded as vocational education.

Some concerns that Dr. Dowd said he had gotten from discussing the issue with local directors were:

1. Assurances in the bill and/or TEA that money will be spent on the programs that actually earn the funds.
2. Protection of the rights of the high cost teacher.
3. TEA must retain a leadership role.
4. Assurances against overloading especially in high weight programs.
5. Provisions made to support the local Independent School District in the additional work generated by increased accountability.

It was asked if the Governor's office was the only one pushing the FTE concept. The answer was no, that they were working with Senate Education Committee and staff as well as Texas Education Agency.

REPORT FROM SECTION ON - EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION - Mr. Charles Jones, Chairman

This report includes a summary of the following speaker on the above subject, Wednesday and Thursday, October 9-10, 1974:

Mr. Eugene Fisher, Texas A&M University

Recorders were:

Mr. John Hutchinson, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mr. Arturo Salazar, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mr. Gerald Bekker, EPDA Fellow, TAMU

The 1968 Vocational Education Amendments call for evaluation to answer the following questions:

1. Are programs preparing individuals for which employment opportunities exist?

2. Are programs designed to meet the needs of the students currently enrolled?

Characteristics and purposes of evaluation:

1. Basic purpose is to improve instruction.

2. Evaluation must be continuous.

3. Evaluation is both formal and informal.

4. To indicate how effective programs are.

The process of formal evaluation includes:

1. Notify the instructors that a program evaluation will take place. Explain the purpose of the evaluation from a positive view point. Explain evaluation procedures and forms to the instructor. Set deadline for completing the form.

2. Review the forms that are returned by the teachers.

3. Discuss the form with the instructor; pointing out both strengths and weaknesses. Obtain a commitment on how and when improvements will be accomplished.

The local education agency should make annual evaluation to establish if:

1. Programs are realistic.

2. Programs are suited to needs and abilities of students.

3. Programs are effective in job placement of students.

The following factors contribute to successful program evaluation:

1. Philosophy for each specific program.

2. Specific program objectives.

3. Individual course data for program evaluation.

   a. Lab and classroom space.
   b. Budget for reference books, supplies, and equipment.

4. Program objectives must be understood by the instructor, the student, the administration, and the counselor.

5. Advisory committee - is there proof that the committee is active?

6. Instructional program facilities.

7. Instructor/Coordinator - resourceful, professional.

8. Program facilities.

9. Shop and classroom organization and movement.

10. Instructional materials, are they up to date?

11. Shop housekeeping and safety.

12. Leadership development program - student organizations.

13. Existing relationships between the instructor and the students, parents, and potential employer. Teachers must maintain their contacts with people in business and industry.

14. Placement and follow-up must be a team approach between teachers and vocational counselors. Follow-up must determine how successful former students have been.

Evaluation:

1. Texas State Plan states local agencies should make an evaluation to determine quality and effectiveness of each program using an instrument approved by the district.

2. Evaluation should include activities and services to meet the needs, interests, and abilities of vocational programs.

3. Program evaluation should be continuous in order to spot areas for improvement.

Follow-up program - Bryan I.S.D. - An approach to follow up:

1. Inform teachers on follow-up and get them committed to it.

2. Precondition students before they leave school.

3. Information is sought from student on his birthday.

Information yielded by a follow-up program:

1. Critique of programs.

   a. Training-quality.
   b. Facilities.

2. How much did school assist students in obtaining employment?

3. Need state report information.

Questions from the floor:

1. Should the principal and counselor be on the advisory committee?

2. Should there be one advisory committee for duplicate programs in a large district or should there be a committee for each program in each school?

3. Should students be on the advisory committee?

4. Can a maximum rather than a minimum be placed on student enrollment as a program?

5. Why do you need 64 students to obtain a double unit?

6. Are printed courses of study,"canned courses",sufficient?

7. Is there an estimate of the volume and out-put of the Bryan follow-up program?

8. What kind of code is used to identify students?

9. Does program (follow-up) handle students who change programs or double employment?

10. Has an analysis been made of the reason a student drops out on the day he leaves and the reason he would give two years later?

11. How do you keep the follow-up study from eating up the above $400 that is received for TEA?

12. What was the percentage of return on the follow-up conducted by TAMU?

13. Is there a sample of the forms in any of the follow-up booklets?

The end product of evaluating process will be improved vocational programs that are efficient and realistic for job opportunities.

REPORT FROM SECTION ON - TECHNIQUES OF SUPERVISION - O.M. Holt, Chairman

This report includes a summary of the following speaker on the above subject, Wednesday and Thursday, October 9-10, 1974:

Dr. O. M. Holt
Mayor of College Station, Texas

Recorders were:

Mr. Ed Binder, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mrs. Bobbie Riggs, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mrs. Florence Hood, EPDA Fellow, TAMU

Vocational education today differs in emphasis from that of several years ago. Today, federal funds are flowing into vocational education. Likewise, 80% of job-holding people are in jobs that do not require college degrees. This situation causes questions and problems with which vocational administrators must deal. Some of the problems are:

I. Not all teachers are equally competent and motivated. Some change, some never change. What do you do with these teachers?

   A. The director does not have the authority to handle the problem. He can only make recommendations to the principal and other school administrators.

   B. Personal evaluation between teachers and supervisors should be discussed openly and filed in supervisor's office.

   C. Problems are compounded when people work up through another channel besides education.

   D. Concept of career education is great; however, this supplementation of career education is not so great.

II. Problems are created by not hiring people we think can honestly produce.

   A. People are sometimes hired and it is not known what they can or cannot do.

   B. One solution is to attract good people through offering fringe benefits for certain number of years experiences.

   C. Raise salary scale for skilled people. Give credit for experiences.

III. Accountability

A Do we in vocational education always have to have high level kids? There are various levels we can teach. Each student does not need to do the same thing at the same level of competency.

B If we as teachers are not competent, maybe a method of eliminating persons out of the teaching field is needed. Teachers need to produce.

C. Strive to raise the level of teaching.

IV. Are we, in vocational education, telling our story?

A. Statistics regarding 529 students indicated that parents of vocational education students had 1.2 higher grade level than pre-college students. Not many people know this.

V. How to measure supervisory staff? How to raise the lead of the teacher?

A. Teacher training is fast. There should be a closer relationship with first year personnel, especially skilled persons. Help skilled persons develop confidence. Many times they have more expertise than degree teachers.

B. Train skilled people with methods of teaching.

C. Give teachers expertise by in-service training and returning to industry for academic credit.

VI. How does curriculum happen?

A. Teachers may teach subject regardless of student needs.

B. Advisory committee may give input as to student needs.

VII. What techniques are vocational directors employing to improve performance of teachers?

A. Visitation program to each teacher.

B. Channel interested students into courses.

C. Work positively with the teacher. Show interest in the program. A director needs preplans before working with a teacher. This may include objectives, goals, and other aspects to help the teacher understand the nature of his job.

D. A checklist may be used with teachers on program evaluation. This will allow the director to put down what he is thinking and help the teacher recognize his problem and his strengths.

E. Informal get-togethers can help a struggling teacher.

VIII. How to work effectively with the staff.

A. Be understanding and be sympathetic with human needs.

B. Always be available to the staff and make them aware of it.

C. Maintain a two-way flow of communication.

D. Do what needs to be done now to help the staff do its job.

E. The role should not be that of a supervisor in its strict sense but rather that of a helper or consultant.

F. Gain respect of the staff to the end that the supervisor's assistance is sought.

G. One must be able to identify weaknesses in members of the staff, but more importantly, get the staff member to recognize his own weaknesses. How?
1. Utilize members of the advisory council.
2. Make use of skilled craftsman in working with teachers.
3. Former students can sometimes help.
4. Utilize youth organization competition in various contests to permit a teacher to recognize strengths and weaknesses.

IX. How to establish effective communication links within the school district.

A. Keep the principal informed about what is going on and involve him where practical.

B. Be a part of the school system and pursue good relationships with other faculty members.

C. Publicize the program through all means available and permissible.

D. Keep counselors informed of the scope and purpose of program offerings.

X. How to gather information on the programs you supervise.

A. What happens to the end product, the student?

B. Many times student interest as reflected by the enrollment can be used to reflect the effectiveness of the program.

C. Be informal with teachers.

D. Do not structure class visitation programs. Secure permission to visit.

E. If evaluation reports are required by the district, make the teacher aware of them. Ask him to participate in a self evaluation and go over it with him. Make him aware of exactly what is to be reported.

F. Do not depend on student comments as the source of information to form opinions as to the effectiveness of the teacher.

XI. Using the staff in helping to establish and work toward achieving organizational goals.

A. Meet with staff, formally or informally, over coffee or some other means, to establish consensus of "Why are we here? What are the common elements in all vocational programs, and what can be done to more effectively achieve our goals?"

REPORT FROM SECTION ON - MANAGEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION - J. B. Whiteley, Chairman

This report includes a summary of the following speakers and resource persons on the above subject, Wednesday and Thursday, October 9-10, 1974.

Mr. J. B. Whiteley, Deputy Superintendent, Occupational and Continuing Education, Houston Public Schools
Dr. W. B. Mansfield, Texas Engineering Extension Service, Texas A&M University
Dr. James Boone, Industrial Education Department, Texas A&M University

Recorders were:

Mrs. Edith Bullock, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mr. March Hull, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mr. Jerry Davidson, Vocational Director, Bastrop ISD

Dr. James Boone substituted for J. B. Whiteley on Wednesday, October 9, 1974.

DR. JAMES BOONE

Management is working with people. We will concentrate on management of resources, especially people.

DR. W. B. MANSFIELD

There are certain common elements in the management process irrespective of what is managed. There are five steps in the process and they include:

1. Planning.
2. Organizing.
3. Staffing.
4. Directing.
5. Controlling.

Groups were developed to define and list the major activities of each step.

Group Reports:

I. Planning

A. Definition - those activities designed to lead to the described objectives.

B. Major functions and activities.
   1. Preparation - survey of needs and goal setting.
   2. Other functions of management process are involved.
   3. Follow-up and evaluation.

C. Revised definition - The identification of goals and objectives and the selection of methods, procedures, and processes to accomplish objectives.

II. Organizing

A. Definition - an orderly development of the needed resources to carry out the goals and objectives established in the planning process.

B. Major functions.
   1. Identify specific tasks to be performed to carry out goals and objectives - keeping in mind general time frame of objectives and considering time requirements for specific tasks.
   2. Identify key positions responsible for carrying out specific tasks.
   3. Identify total resource needs to accomplish goals and objectives.
   4. Develop a more definite time schedule.
   5. Look at all the alternatives.

III. Staffing

A. Definition - securing qualified people to do the job that needs to be done.

B. Major functions and activities.
   1. Finding candidates.
   2. Interviewing.
   3. Selecting and determining where they fit best.
   4. Assigning responsibilities.
   5. Following up.

IV. Directing and Coordinating

A. Definition - the act of observing all the management functions and corrections - communications between all interested parties.

B. Major functions and activities.
   1. Observation.
   2. Change.
   3. Manipulation.
   4. Policy implementation.
   5. Public relations at all levels.

V. Controlling

A. Definition - to audit the rate at which resources are expended to achieve an objective.

B. Major functions and activities.
1. Auditing time, money, facilities, and programs to achieve objectives.

C. Controlling is managerical cybernetics evaluating the degree to which objectives are being met. There are alternatives in each of the basic functions of management that must be weighted in light of the objectives.

A 40 minute film "The Uncalculated Risk" written and illustrated by William V. Haney was shown.

Implications of the Film

We do have to make decisions on things other than facts, inferences, and assumptions. Approach decision making from point of view that things may not come out right. Be prepared to make changes to get things back on the track.

REPORT FROM SECTION ON - THE ROLE OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL OFFICER - Dr. Donald Clark, Chairman

This report includes a summary of the following speaker on the above subject, Wednesday and Thursday, October 9-10, 1974:

Dr. William Knaak, Superintendent
Area Vocational-Technical Institute
St. Paul, Minnesota

Recorders were:

Mr. Floyd Bevers, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mrs. Lois Trahan, EPDA Fellow, TAMU
Mr. Benton L. Brockette, Vocational Director, Beaumont ISD

Dr. Donald Clark opened the sessions by giving the purpose of the meeting; helping to develop more effective leaders in the instructional area.

Dr. William Knaak opened with the rationale for his being the choice in presenter. It was based on experience and work done in the Vocational-Technical Institute in Minnesota. He indicated, in looking at the function of vocational-technical schools, the role of the instructional officer is most important.

The Vocational-Technical Institute, Minnesota style, was explained. It is very much like Texas Area Vocational School except that it includes both post-high and high school students. The institute draws students from nine high school districts and has 1,200 post-high and 1,000 high school students.

The institute has 95 training programs in operation and is due for further expansion next year. The types of programs and areas were explained. The six areas include:

1. Technical Laboratory
2. Allied Services-Office Occupations

3. Allied Services-Distributive Education

4. Allied Services-Food Services

5. Health Occupations

6. Transportation and Horticulture

With the background of the institute explained, Dr. Knaak gave a definition of the role of the instructional officer. It represents the responsibility for the maintenance and improvement of the instructional program.

A greater demand for individualized instruction has come about because of accountability demanded by both taxpayers and students. This has been created by the type of fundings and model the vocational system patterned itself after. Personalized and individualized instruction were used interchangeably by the speaker. His personal preference was personalized.

In order to accomplish the task of individualized instruction, the system must be taken into consideration first. The difference between instruction and teaching must be considered. Instruction is the process of learning, while teaching is the process of active participation by the teacher in the process.

The factors of the system are time, content, learning style, and proficiency. These factors can be fixed or variable. The changing of the type of factor and influence on that factor will change the system.

Dr. Knaak presented a handout to illustrate what consideration must be taken into account in presenting material to students. These considerations were: preference in receiving directions, kinds of associations, motivators in course works, need-to-know about success in learning, and

decision-making style.

Vocational education can be improved through personalized instruction. What is needed is competent staff, relevant instructional material and students willing and able to profit from instruction.

Vocational administration and teachers both have considerations to be taken into account. Training, funds, and students are key issues important for consideration.

Cost savings is a plus for individualized instruction. This is brought about by greater student movement toward graduation. However, this doesn't apply very readily to high school, only post-high school.

The use of conventional administration methods with instructional systems, as outlined, will result in costing more money. They simply don't mix.

A dental program was outlined to show development cost of materials. It started with $1,250 per student to provide 40 hours of instruction. However, over a period of time development cost went down to $25 per student for 40 hours of instruction. Cost can be cut down if ready made instructional materials are used. They are available, however, for only the common, numerous types of programs.

The instructional system design was shown and consisted of job description, then task analysis. Out of this came performance objectives to form individualized packages. Media used in these packages shown used varied media.

A slide-tape presentation on mobile home service was given to show how the system operates. The process went from how the student enters the program, to testing and contract for goals within the occupation and process by which students progress through the learning packages.

Question and discussion session:

Q. Can high school students progress through and complete early?

A. Most students don't get out early. Motivation problems exist even in an individualized instruction. Counseling is also a problem because of large range of programs (45).

Q. Do students go in 2 hour blocks?

A. Yes, they are based from their home school. Vocational-Technical Institute receives 1/3 ADA from state.

Q. What is the percent of students who go into occupations for which they are trained?

A. 92% in mobile home service, 90% overall placement based on 50% completion of occupational area.

Q. Who develops curriculum?

A. It started with instructional staff on a two month development basis. Now it is done the best way possible.

Q. Is there a correlation between reading ability and student success?

A. Problems exist in certain occupation areas; however, the method of direction giving is important. Audio visual material is used to overcome reading problems. Reading instruction is also given student who needs it.

Q. Qualification of instructors at Minnesota?

A. Certified vocational teacher requirements plus writing ability.

Video tape of "What is Involved in Curriculum Development?"

In entering an occupational area, a student tests out of each area in which he has prior knowledge. This continues until he cannot pass a pre-test on an area within that occupation. The student then contracts for the terminal performance objective within a specified time period. Within the occupational area are micro performance objectives. These objectives are made up of learning steps and resource material used to provide and accomplish objectives.

Learning and doing are both provided by instructional material. Instructors are used to assist the students with problems in accomplishing the objectives. They also provide motivation and stimulus to students.

Both pre- and post-tests are of the knowing and doing type. Knowing test must be passed before doing test, under the supervision of the instructor, can be attempted.

A learning package should be able to be accomplished in two or three days. If not, the feeling of success is lost. Student needs (rate and style of learning) must be considered in order for him to accomplish his goals.

The advantages and disadvantages of instructor developed and commercially purchased instructional material were discussed. The merit of each depends on the situation under which the administrator has to operate.

Q. What are the pay scales for teachers?

A. Instructors are paid in the $10,250 to $14,900 range. Lead instructors get $12,250 to $20,500.

Q. Do colleges accept hours earned in Vocational-Technical Institutes?

A. Yes, based on one credit for 30 clock hours applicable to degrees in colleges and universities.

Q. How do you start a unit if the cost of an instructor is in the $6,000 - $7,000 range?

A. Not very easily, especially in areas of high skill occupation.

Q. Are the pre-test and post-test available for purchase?

A. Yes, in some areas, but they may not be valid without the learning package for which they were designed.

The operational styles of administrators and teachers (via handout sheet) were tested and classified. Operational style was based on how one treats the persons with whom he must work.

The life style in which co-workers and superiors can fit were listed

as: formalistic, socialistic, and personalistic.

The life style can be used to determine how to work with persons in curriculum and other areas. Persons in positions of control must be flexible in motivating people to fit the life style in which they operate. Administrators and teachers must ignore their own style in order to fit the style of the group with which they work. If not, the best interaction and resulting work will not necessarily come about.

VOCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPERVISORS CONFERENCE
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Conference Evaluation

The people in attendance were asked to evaluate the conference on a scale from excellent to poor. Given below, in percentage, are the results of this evaluation in given areas concerning this conference.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
First General Session	51.3%	42.5%	5.7%	.5%
Second General Session	45.8%	40.1%	8.3%	5.7%
Sectional Meetings				
Community Relations	22%	62%	14%	2%
Financing Vocational Education	58.4%	36.7%	4.2%	1%
Evaluation of Vocational Education	25.3%	50.7%	20%	4%
Techniques of Supervision	23.9%	46.7%	20.7%	8.7%
Management of Vocational Education	38%	47.8%	11.5%	2.7%
Role of the Instructional Officer	25%	32.8%	37.5%	4.7%
Membership Meetings				
Texas Association of Directors and Supervisors, Occupational Education and Technology	22.9%	48%	24%	5%
Reports from the Sectional Meetings	22.5%	58.3%	17.6%	1.6%
Third General Session	18.6%	66.7%	13.5%	1.3%
Effectiveness of Consultants	36.8%	57.5%	5.2%	.6%
Relevance of the Conference to problems you encounter in your work	41.4%	40.8%	14.7%	3.1%
Usefulness of information secured from the Conference	33.5%	51.6%	13.7%	1.1%

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Extent to which the objectives of the Conference were accomplished	35.1%	54.8%	7.8%	2.1%
Efficiency in utilization of time in accomplishing the objectives of the Conference	44.6%	44.6%	8.7%	2.2%
Quality of the overall plan of the Conference	58.9%	37.5%	3.6%	0
Suitability of the Conference facilities	90.7%	7.7%	1%	.5%
What is your overall appraisal of the Conference	48.4%	48.4%	3.1%	0

In the evaluation, four opinion questions were asked. The answers to these are on the left and the number of times that responses occurred is on the right.

What was the most meaningful part of the Conference to you?

1)	Finance	101
2)	Sectional Meetings	31
3)	Discussion with other directors	25
4)	Consultants	13
5)	Byrl Shoemaker address	10
6)	Association meetings	7
7)	General Sessions	6
8)	Joe Mills address	4
9)	Ben Dowd address	2
10)	Swap-Shop	2
11)	Comfortable facilities	1

What was the least meaningful part of the Conference to you?

1)	Association meetings	18
2)	Sectional summaries	10
3)	Role of Instructional Officer	7
4)	Evaluation of Vocational Education	6
5)	Techniques of Supervision	6
6)	Management of Vocational Education	4
7)	Night Sessions	4
8)	Community Relations	2
9)	Subject areas concerning other states	2
10)	General Sessions	2

Please make any other comments you wish concerning the Conference.

1)	Very good	26
2)	Very well coordinated	9
3)	Would like to attend all topics listed	8
4)	Good steering committee	3
5)	Move Conference to another city	3
6)	Major speeches should be made available for purchase on tape	2
7)	Should involve more principals and superintendents	2
8)	Develop small group session with state staff	2
9)	Schedule too hurried	2
10)	Excellent meeting place	2
11)	More emphasis on program building	1
12)	Should include news media coverage	1

What suggestions do you have for future conferences of this nature?

1)	Have an annual conference	28
2)	Make section meetings shorter	12
3)	Need for more practical information for local problems	11
4)	Local input prior to planning the conference	9
5)	Allow free time in the evenings	7
6)	Need smaller groups for informal exchange of ideas	6
7)	Be more specific in subject areas (for local assistance)	6
8)	Allow local directors to make a 10-15 minute presentation on what they have done well. Follow up with questions	5
9)	Allow more time for visiting with other directors	4
10)	Confine smoking to breaks	4
11)	Limit conference to two days	2
12)	Have two conferences per year	2
13)	Invite more TEA personnel	2
14)	Provide materials and literature to take home	1
15)	Conference should be 1 or 2 days	1